Half-Justice for Huey Newton, P. 2

Subversion Marches On And Upward To The Very Top of The Republican Party

The Republican National Chairman, Rep. Rogers C. B. Morton, said today the Vietnam war no longer served the national interest, and predicted that the Cambodian foray would help make it possible to "get the hell out of there." "The national interest is not there anymore," he said in a lunchtime discussion with newsmen.—New York Times, *June 1.*

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

VOL. XVIII, No. 12 JUNE 15, 1970 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

When Doves Turn Hawk

The American Jewish Congress placed an advertisement in the *New York Times* June 2 containing an open letter to the President signed by seven Senators. The seven have been leaders of the fight to end the Indochinese war. In that ad the seven doves turned hawk on the Middle East. The seven were Mc Govern, Hughes, Goodell, Cranston, Hart, Eagleton and Young of Ohio. We found their reversal appalling. We believe these Senators and the American Jewish Congress did a disservice to the cause of peace and to the American Jewish community by a blatant turnabout which offered Nixon a blank check for a new war.

Another Nuclear Confrontation?

The letter was part of the campaign to pressure the U.S. to sell Israel 125 more Phantom and Skyhawk planes. But it went beyond the sale of planes. It went so far as to hint support for another nuclear confrontation like that in the Cuban missile crisis. "The night you announced that American troops were crossing the border into Cambodia," the letter said, "you spoke of the firmness displayed by President John F. Kennedy, a firmness backed by the entire nation, when the Soviet Union attempted to place missiles in Cuba. It may well be that we now face in the Middle East a Soviet threat that is equally ominous and provocative." That sounds more like Strom Thurmond than George McGovern.

The situation in the Middle East is indeed a dangerous one, far more dangerous than in Indochina. Huge U.S. and Soviet fleets, armed with nuclear weapons, all but jostle each other in the Mediterranean. The Middle East contains a major part of the world's oil resources, much of it in American hands. A shift of the Arab states from the Western to the Soviet sphere of influence would change the strategic balance of power, outflanking Western Europe and Africa. The danger is real enough without the kind of reckless exaggeration which equates long range Soviet nuclear missiles in Cuba, missiles which could attack the United States, with conventional SAM-3 anti-aircraft missiles in Egypt. Their purpose is to prevent a repetition of last winter's Israeli attacks upon Cairo. The SAM3s have not prevented the Israeli air force from relentlessly pounding the Egyptian side of the Canal zone itself in the savage war of attrition being waged there, from Egypt's side by artillery, in which the Israeli are vastly outnumbered, and from Israel's side by air, where she has supremacy.

The Brink At Suez

A tacit but precarious agreement between the Soviets and Israel has so far avoided an armed clash between them by keeping the Soviet forces away from the Canal Zone. A clash of the utmost gravity could come at any time if Israeli pilots again raided deep into Egypt or Soviet pilots intervened in the battle over the Suez. Otherwise Israel controls the skies over all her borders. "Even sympathetic Western observers here," Oswald Johnston wrote from Tel Aviv in the *Baltimore Sun* June 7, "recognize that the recent urgent cry for 125 more Skyhawks and Phantoms reflect not so much a real military need as a desire to have the United States underwrite unconditionally the hard-line policies of the present [Israeli] government for the foreseeable future."

Here we come to the nub of the problem. The doves-turned-hawk said in their letter that they did not want their opposition to the Indochinese war to be misinterpreted in the Soviet Union "as a sign that our nation will not take effective steps to protect our vital national interests in the Middle East." But this is hawk talk and the hawk mentality. We have a right to a more thoughtful view from McGovern and his six colleagues. America's vital national interest in the Middle East is not fundamentally different from that in the Far East. Our national interest lies in the resolution of basic conflicts by negotiation. So does Israel's.

Force Has Failed In Both Areas

The doves-turned-hawk said there were "fundamental differences" between the situations in the Far and Middle East. "The government of Israel is a democracy," they said. "This is not true of the regimes our armed forces are supporting in Southeast Asia." This may be true but it is irrelevant. The essential similarities between the two situations is that, in each, an effort is being made to solve a political problem by military

(Continued On Page Four)

The Kind of Bums Nixon Likes

The hard hat is symbolically important, of course, not only because of the peaceful demonstration organized by the White House visitors, but also because of earlier events . . . [in which] enraged mobs of workers paraded through the financial district, overwhelming the police and beating the unfaithful along the way. While the President has certainly not praised this behavior, neither has he—or any other Administration official—publicly condemned it. In the circumstances, it is possible to imagine that the Administration considers kicking bystanders in the head, swinging and throwing tools, spitting upon and assaulting individuals for making "V" signs with their fingers, all less reprehensible than, say, throwing stones at armed, helmeted National Guardsmen. Now that the President has donned a hard hat we would forgive any construction worker who believed Mr. Nixon's embrace included not only those who attended the rally but those who bashed heads as well. We think this is no time for such ambiguity.

—*Wall Street Journal editorial, May 28.* (abridged)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Truth Begins To Leak Out On Nixon's Captured Weapon Figures . . .

ANY SOCIETY TREATS ITS CONFORMISTS WELL and even the worst dictatorship allow freedom of expression to those who support it. The test of a legal system is how it treats the hated, the feared and the despised. The reversal of Huey Newton's conviction for voluntary manslaughter by the California Court of Appeals chalks up a half-victory for justice in our society but only half because he is still being denied bail on appeal. The "error" on which reversal was based is no technicality. Mr. Newton claimed that he couldn't have killed a policeman in the shoot-out which led to his conviction because he was himself unconscious from a police bullet wound. The trial judge failed to instruct the jury that if it believed the evidence of his unconsciousness, it could not find him guilty. Behind the whole affair and the continued denial of bail is the deep animosity of police to black militants, indeed to any black who will not accept humiliation. I believe not only Mr. Newton but the New York Panther defendants will eventually go free; more reversible errors and much evidence of police misconduct is turning up in the New York pre-trial proceeding. Justice for the Panthers would go a long way toward rebuilding that faith in our judicial system so essential to domestic peace.

Wallace Pushed Finch Out

FINCH'S TRANSFER FROM HEW to the White House is the first fruit of Wallace's victory in Alabama. Nixon's response to the Wallace victory will be to intensify his "Southern strategy." This increased the danger that Finch might defect with a public protest. He will be safer under political lock and key in the White House. Richardson, from whom much was hoped, was a patsy in State and will be a pushover in HEW. . . .

IT IS A PITY THE WHOLE COUNTRY could not have listened in when Nixon met with the high brass at San Clemente before his June 3 soothing syrup report on the Cambodian invasion. Except for Kissinger, the President met only with the military. The State Department was conspicuous by its absence. Acheson warned Johnson, "the Joint Chiefs of Staff don't know what they're talking about" but no ranking civilian was there to challenge the pap they gave the President. It was reflected in the June 3 speech which will turn out to be the kind of malarkey which led to Johnson's undoing. A briefing in Saigon June 8 of which the best account was John E. Woodruff's in the *Baltimore Sun* June 9 began to disclose the truth about those bloated figures and silly photographs Nixon showed on TV. The Saigon briefer admitted that of 8,332 weapons captured by forces from III Corps, half were pistols or obsolete weapons and only about 550 were the AK-47, the standard infantry weapon used by the enemy. Nixon's body count will prove as spurious. If his figures were right, we killed a fourth of the enemy forces in Cambodia, though they fought only rearguard actions! Now Saigon intelligence has added to its estimates of enemy forces in Cambodia 36,000 men, or four times the number we claimed to have killed! This number game is typical of the J. Walter Thompson war being waged by Nixon's entourage. What he says is about on a par with the soap and aspirin advertising so many of the White House staff were trained to write.

THE CREEPING CENSORSHIP that is slowly lowering the curtain on our open society reached a new stage when Chairman Passman (D. La.) of the House Appropriations subcommittee on foreign aid, without consulting his subcommittee, allowed Secretary of State Rogers to black out every question and answer in his appearance to discuss U.S. aid operations the world over. This was the State Department's panicky reaction to the leak from the subcommittee of testimony in which Rogers on the eve of the Cambodian invasion said no such move was contemplated. State Dept. claimed this was taken our of context but confessed that this was untrue when the entire context was censored out of the hearings. When the Secretary of State is that uninformed, and censorship can be used to black out his words to a Congressional committee, we are further down the road to a military-dominated government.

WHILE THE ADMINISTRATION CONTINUED TO LEAK optimistic stories about the SALT talks, *Aviation Week* (June 8) said Pentagon and State Dept. officials "do not believe any major move toward disarmament will come from SALT. At

Even The Questions Were Censored Out

I have sat on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee for 12 years . . . I have never leaked anything out of the committee that was of secret or confidential nature. Now during the hearings on April 23 with Secretary of State Rogers, I asked questions on a great number of things. I asked about Latin America, especially in light of the Rockefeller report. I asked about the French sale of jets to Libya and the effect it would have upon the balance of arms in the Middle East. I asked about the entire Middle East situation, which is one of the most explosive ones facing the world today . . .

These are all important questions that the public should know about. Yet now they are buried in the committee where nobody can read them. . . . My questions were classified. How is the national security adversely affected by what I have to ask? They were just plain frank questions that are being asked each and every day by constituents coming into our offices.

—Rep. Silvio Conte, (R.-Mass), Cong. Rec. June 4.

National Editor of The Washington Post Answers Charges Made by The Harvard Crimson

I was sorry to see your June 1 issue quoting the *Harvard Crimson* quoting me as saying that the *Washington Post* would hire no more political activists. The fact is that most of the applicants for summer internships that Ben Bradlee and I interviewed were activists of one kind or another. The most intelligent and responsible students today are passionately involved in contemporary issues and to reject them out of hand would defeat the whole purpose of the internship program, which is to get the best young people into journalism. What we did with each applicant was to pose the question, sometimes with a hypothetical situation, of how one separates the role of professional journalist whose job is to report an event to the whole community from his personal desires as a citizen. It's a tough question for which there is no easy answer. But I think it's a legitimate question.

A man wearing a big, "Down with Fulbright" button showing up to interview Fulbright, or going to a presidential press conference carrying an anti-war banner, has altered an event he is there to report. The answers we got from applicants varied enormously. We were less interested in their absolute position than in the thoughtfulness of their replies. If men with strong personal convictions, liberal or conservative, were excluded from journalism, the news would be nothing but pabulum. But if journalistic institutions made no distinction in their news columns between their private desires and a fair account of what they observe, public paranoia and incredulousness would reach even more dangerous levels than they have already.

—Letter to the Editor of the Bi-Weekly *by Ben Bagdikian, National Editor,* Washington Post.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . Nobody Mentioned Bloodbaths When Suharto Came to Washington

best they foresee slight reductions—or ceilings—in deployed weapons." *AW* says the Russians want to scrap the ABM altogether while the U.S. is holding out for "a limited ABM." "Pentagon Says ABM and MIRV Can Be Halted If Arms Pact Develops," a *New York Times* headline proclaimed June 5 but *AW* reports "On the MIRV ban, U.S. officials believe talks are exactly one year late from the point of view of stopping deployment because critical tests have already been conducted."

Nobody Listening?

THOUGH IT PUTS THE FINGER on the very nerve center of the arms race, a petition signed by 436 MIT professors, a majority of the faculty, was almost entirely ignored by the press when presented at a conference June 4 by Senator Brooke. "The security of the United States," the petition said, "is not automatically increased by the construction of every weapon that is technically feasible." It called on the President and Congress to discontinue the secret projects aimed to develop MIRVs which can home in on enemy missiles so accurately they can be used for a first strike. The petitioners said this threatens to heighten tension and stimulate a new, costly and more unstabilizing phase of the arms race. MIT is the center of these missile projects, but nobody seems to be listening.

SPEAKING OF BLOODBATHS: Nixon keeps saying that a Communist take-over in South Vietnam would lead to a bloodbath. In his Nov. 3 speech he claimed 50,000 were killed when they took over in North Vietnam 15 years ago. More than twice that number were killed when Suharto took over in Indonesia but Nixon said nothing of bloodbaths when he welcomed the Indonesian military dictator to Washington a few days ago. The May 26 *Congressional Record* contains several pages of documentary "bloodbath" materials put in by Senator Kennedy (pps. 7805-10) which cast a great deal of doubt on Nixon's 50,000 figure for Vietnam in 1954.

UNDER PAPANDREOU GREECE TRIED to raise compulsory schooling to nine years. The Greek dictatorship is trying to lower it to five or four. Papadapoulous in an address last year attributed much of the unrest in the world to excess knowledge. This recalls Agnew's speech at Des Moines April 13, "I do not accept the proposition that every American boy and girl should go to a 4-year college . . ."

LABOR'S LEADING OSTRICH: George Meany issued a lengthy statement about the rise of unemployment to 5% and "the complete failure of the Administration's economic policies" without once mentioning the war as a cause of inflation! . . . AFTER A QUARTER CENTURY in missile electronics, A.T. & T. is opting out of anti-missile work after its Safeguard contract is over. *Science News* (May 30) reports that in a secret meeting a year ago Bell officials told Laird the latest Pentagon-ordered changes in the original Sentinel system had made it unworkable. "One could hardly expect," Dr. Ralph Lapp is quoted in comment, "that you could make a Volkswagen do what a Cadillac could do." Chances of blocking the second stage of Safeguard in Congress are good . . . WE SALUTE THE MILITANT ANTI-WAR position taken by the UAW's new President Leonard Woodcock and see in him a worthy successor to Walter Reuther as a leavening influence in our stodgy labor movement.

The Military Black-Out In The Budget

Our deficits and our debts [in the national budget] are planned and ordered in the Pentagon—which directs the deployment of 300,000 military men in Western Europe, another contingent almost as large in Japan, Okinawa, and the western Pacific. To this must be added the horrendous cost of men and material in Vietnam and Cambodia. These costs are a secret to almost everyone. Neither operation or incursion appears in the Federal deficit or in an explanation of the Federal debt. Neither the Ways and Means Committee nor the Congress has an accurate idea of the fiscal 1970 costs of either Vietnam or Cambodia or the cost projection for fiscal 1971. This is an incredible way to run a country. The most crucial costs are confounded and concealed . . .

—Rep. Vanik (D. Ohio), *Congressional Record, June 3.*

How TV Networks Keep National Debate on The War And Other Basic Issues One-Sided

The Congress is at a disadvantage in the war powers debate, as it is discussing most issues, because the Executive has a near monopoly on effective access to public attention. The President can command a national television audience to hear his views on controversial matters at prime time, on short notice, at whatever length he chooses, and at no expense to the Federal government or to his party. Other constitutional office-holders are compelled to rely on highly selective newspaper articles and TV news spots, which at most will convey bits and snatches of their points of view, usually selected in such a way as to create an impression of cranky carping at an heroic and beleaguered President . . .

The problem for a Senator or Senate committee is not simply one of being heard. Anything that has the color of scandal, accusation, or prediction will command eager attention from the media. What you cannot easily interest them in is an idea, or a carefully exposited point of view, or an unfamiliar perspective, or a reasoned rebuttal to a highly controversial Presidential statement. In recent weeks for example the Foreign Relations committee has heard thoughtful and significant statements on the war by eminent business men, political and military leaders and theologians but owing to the lack of interest of the media, these proceedings have been a well-kept secret between the witnesses and the members of the committee . . . the only way to get the media to swallow an idea is by candy coating it with a prediction or an accusation.

Take for example the issue now under discussion about the war powers of the Congress. . . . The whole country heard the President hold forth in his recent press conference about how he alone—and I emphasize he alone—as Commander in Chief was responsible for the conduct of the war, the expansion of the war into a neutral country, and the safety of our fighting men. The very words "Commander in Chief" are intoned with a reverential awe appropriate to 18th century courtiers . . . but virtually no one outside of this Chamber has heard the thoughtful and learned expositions of Senators on constitutional doctrine and the intent of the Framers. The result is that the country is suffused with the constitutional theories of Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon, while the contrasting views of Jefferson, Hamilton, and Madison remain buried in history. . . .

The networks have not only denied the opposition equal time to reply to Presidential statements, but will not even permit the Democratic National Committee to purchase broadcasting time at commercial rates. CBS has said that it has a general rule against selling time for the presentation of controversial views except during election campaigns. The network, of course, sets itself up as the sole judge of what is "controversial." In my opinion the moon flights are controversial—I think them an extravagant waste—but the networks provide millions of dollars worth of time to permit us to view every last boring detail in living color.

—Fulbright in a Senate speech June 2 asking legislation to require the TV chains to give Congress equal time to answer presidential speeches.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Peace In The Middle East Depends on Justice For Arab Refugees

(Continued From Page One)

means. That has not worked in the Far East and it will not work in the Middle East. Neither our military superiority in the Far East nor Israel's in the Middle East has been successful in bringing about a settlement. In both areas military force has only intensified counter-action. While the innocent on both sides in the Middle East suffer, the Arab guerrillas have gained political leverage as hate and despair grow.

A Goliath Beyond David's Power

Escalation neared a more perilous stage when the Soviet Sam-3 missiles and pilots appeared in Egypt. Israel's Chief of Staff admitted in a speech May 7 that "the Russians might not have come on the scene" but for Israel's air attacks on Cairo. These, it was foolishly hoped in Israel, would create such panic as to topple Nasser. The Russians, if they had not come to his defense, would have looked like a paper tiger. The next step up in escalation would be a clash between Israeli and Soviet pilots. In a speech on May 26 Mrs. Meir said Israel would not be deterred from risking such a clash if necessary to prevent installation of missile bases on the Egyptian side of the Canal Zone. Her words were bold but this is not a David and Goliath contest Israel could hope to win.

The seven Senators wrote Nixon that in providing Israel with more planes to meet this situation "we would be fulfilling the doctrine which you announced at Guam." This is sycophantic nonsense. Nixon's so-called Guam Doctrine was a warmed-over version of John Foster Dulles's "let Asians fight Asians," a doctrine of which SEATO is a melancholy monument. A conflict between Israel and the Soviet Union would not be "Asians fighting Asians." It would not be war by proxy. The Senators say that our Asian allies "ask that we spill American blood" while "Israel makes no such demand upon us." Maybe. They themselves indicate how dubious this may prove to be when they go on to suggest that we may be approaching another nuclear confrontation like Kennedy's over Cuba. Certainly ten times 125 new planes will not be enough to save Israel if her valiant but tiny air force clashes with Russia's. The U.S. would have to lay it on the line in Israel's defense. And that could spell World War III.

Apparently the Nixon Administration is more dovish than the doves when it comes to the Middle East. Vietnamese experience and oil company pressure have fortified more sober policies. We are glad to see from Secretary Rogers' appearance June 7 on CBS *Face The Nation* that the Administration policy is to offer Israel some planes but tied to conditions which would facilitate a new attempt at peace negotiations. Nasser's latest statements indicate that with Soviet air defenses he feels strong enough to recognize Israel's existence and rights in a settlement. In Tel Aviv Mrs. Meir by accepting the Nov. 1967 UN resolution and the Rhodes formula for talks indicates that she is ready to risk a break with the right wingers in her Cabinet if negotiations can be initiated.

A Last Chance for Peace

This may be a last chance for peace. We do not want America locked into the hard-line policy so natural in Israeli internal politics. America can best help Israel by bringing Arab and Israeli together in a settlement. A basic element of that settlement must be satisfaction for the Arab refugees and the recognition of the Palestinian Arabs as a people. Only on such a basis can a permanent peace be made and Israel accepted by the Arab world. Israel's future depends upon it. The ideal of justice which is at the core of Judaism demands it. No amount of airpower can be a substitute. *June 9*

IBM's Chief on The Revolt of Youth

The key fact is this: 50% of the poulation of this country is under 25, and the longer the war continues the more it broadens the gap between the older generation . . . and our young men and women. Prolongation of the war may well set up a continuing revolution of our youth. Our actions in Vietnam are losing us valuable and traditional friends. We present a picture of a terribly powerful nation unable to manage itself in a disciplined fashion. Our prestige is suffering abroad. Let me illustrate by giving you a rundown of actions against IBM properties in various parts of the world during the last six weeks. In West Berlin nearly all the windows in one of our buildings were broken by young rioters. Then gasoline was poured about and it was set on fire. The windows in one of our Dutch facilities were broken by students. A powerful bomb was discovered just before it was timed to explode in an IBM Argentine office. Here at home we had one actual bombing at 425 Park Avenue in New York City—our Eastern Regional headquarters.

—Thomas J. Watson Jr., chairman of the board IBM testifying on June 2 against the war in Indochina before Senate Foreign Relations. Text in Con. Rec. 6/4.

The 1969 Index Is Now Ready—You Can Have A Copy Free By Sending A LONG Self-Addressed Stamped Envelope For It

We'll Be Glad to Send A Free Copy of This Issue To A Friend — Send A Long Stamped Addressed Envelope

FOR STONE'S HIDDEN HISTORY

For the enclosed $7.50 send I. F. Stone's book, The Hidden History of The Korean War (Monthly Review Press.)

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly 6/15/70

4420 29th St. N. W., Washington, D. C. 20008

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

4420 29th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20008

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly. 2d Class Postage Paid at Washington, D.C. Published every other Monday except in August at 4420 29th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. An independent bi-weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED